

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed on December 4, 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9-21 are rejected. In response, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 2, 9, and 11-21. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,962, hereinafter “Hashimoto”) in view of Badger (U.S. Pat. No. 5,973,664). Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Badger, and further in view of Jaspers (U.S. Pat. No. 6,819,326 B2). As described above, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 2, 9, and 11-21. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over Hashimoto, Badger, and Jaspers for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to recite that “*operating the driving circuit in the second mode includes: setting a base address of the block of line pointers to zero; reading a line pointer that corresponds to the base address of zero from the memory into the address table register means; and successively increasing the base address by one and reading the corresponding line pointer from the memory into the address table register means until the last line pointer of the block of line pointers is downloaded into the address table register means.*” Support for the proposed amendment to claim 1 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 4 and page 5, line 33-page 6, line 6.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Hashimoto in view of Badger fails to teach the above-identified limitation of amended claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Hashimoto in view of Badger.

Hashimoto teaches that an arbitration and control circuit (30) passes an address generated by an address generator (28a) to a memory array (24) so that data may be written into the memory array (24). (See Fig. 2 and column 5, lines 50-52 of Hashimoto). Additionally, Hashimoto teaches that an address generated by an address generator (28b) is transferred to the memory array (24) through the arbitration and control circuit (30) to cause data from the memory array (24) to be read into a read register (20b). (See Fig. 2 and the paragraph between column 5, line 66 and column 6, line 8 of Hashimoto). That is, Hashimoto teaches transferring addresses generated by address generators (28a), (28b) to the memory array (24) so as to write data into the memory array (24) and to read data from the memory array (24), respectively. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Hashimoto fails to teach the above-identified limitation of amended claim 1.

Badger teaches transferring an image (204) from a source memory (202) to a display memory (212) using an X_Counter and an Y_Counter. (See Fig. 8 and column 8, lines 16-39 of Badger). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Hashimoto fails to teach the above-identified limitation of amended claim 1.

Thus, Hashimoto in view of Badger fails to teach all of the limitations of amended claim 1. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Hashimoto in view of Badger.

Dependent Claims 11, 14, 16, and 19

Applicant proposes amending claim 11 to recite that “*operating the driving circuit in the first mode includes: setting the line counter to zero; generating consecutive pixel addresses for video data that corresponds to the line counter of zero; and successively increasing the line counter by one and generating corresponding pixel addresses until the last line pointer of the block of line pointers is read out.*” Applicant proposes amending claim 14 to recite that “*operating the driving circuit in the first mode includes: setting the line counter to zero; generating consecutive pixel addresses for video data that corresponds to the line counter of zero; transferring the video data with the*

generated consecutive pixel addresses to the display; and successively increasing the line counter by one, generating corresponding pixel addresses, and transferring video data with the generated corresponding pixel addresses to the display until the last line pointer of the block of line pointers is read out.” Support for the proposed amendments to claims 11 and 14 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 5, lines 25-32.

Additionally, Applicant proposes amending claim 16 to recite “*moving the block of line pointers in the address table register means into the memory*” and amending claim 19 to recite “*downloading a first block of line pointers from the memory into the address table register means; transferring video data that corresponds to the first block of the line pointers to the display; and successively downloading next blocks of line pointers from the memory into the address table register means and transferring corresponding video data to the display until the last block of line pointers of the full table stored in the memory is downloaded from the memory into the address table register means.*” Support for the proposed amendments to claims 16 and 19 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 5 and page 6, lines 7-15.

Amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that Hashimoto, Badger, and Jaspers fail to teach the above-identified limitations of amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19 are patentable over Hashimoto, Badger, and Jaspers.

Independent Claim 2

Applicant proposes amending claim 2 in a similar fashion to claim 1. Support for the proposed amendment to claim 2 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 4 and page 5, line 33–page 6, line 6. Because of the similarities between amended claim 1 and amended claim 2, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 2. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 2 is patentable over Hashimoto in view of Badger.

Dependent Claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 20

Applicant proposes amending claims 12, 15, 18, and 20 in a similar fashion to claims 11, 14, 16, and 19. Support for the proposed amendments to claims 12 and 15 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 5, lines 25-32. Support for the proposed amendments to claims 18 and 20 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Fig. 5 and page 6, lines 7-15.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 20 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 2. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 20 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 2. Additionally, because of the similarities between amended claims 12, 15, 18, and 20 and amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claims 11, 14, 16, and 19 apply also to amended claims 12, 15, 18, and 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 12, 15, 18, and 20 are patentable over Hashimoto, Badger, and Jaspers.

Independent Claim 9

Applicant proposes amending claim 9 in a similar fashion to claim 1. Support for the proposed amendment to claim 9 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Fig. 4 and page 5, line 33-page 6, line 6. Because of the similarities between amended claim 1 and amended claim 9, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 9 is patentable over Hashimoto in view of Badger.

Dependent Claims 13, 17, and 21

Applicant proposes amending claims 13, 17, and 21 in a similar fashion to claims 11, 16, and 19. Support for the proposed amendment to claim 13 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 5, lines 25-32. Support for the proposed

amendment to claims 17 and 21 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, Fig. 5 and page 6, lines 7-15.

Claims 13, 17, and 21 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 9. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 13, 17, and 21 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 9. Additionally, because of the similarities between amended claims 13, 17, and 21 and amended claims 11, 16, and 19, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claims 11, 16, and 19 apply also to amended claims 13, 17, and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 13, 17, and 21 are patentable over Hashimoto, Badger, and Jaspers.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: January 26, 2010

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111